

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

DD/A REGISTRY
FILE

DD/A Registry

PC-101382/1

FROM: Donald E. Smith
DTE
1026 C of C

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

24 October 1980

STAT

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DDA
7D24 Hqs

See [initials]

2.

[Large rectangular redacted area]

5. [Redacted]
MAY 26 1981.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

The attached draft memorandum for the DDCI incorporates Directorate/Office responses to the NAPA Report on the Language Incentive Program and provides a DDA recommendation on major issues in the report. The NAPA recommendations are loosely scattered throughout the report in various forms, and we hope that we have addressed all major concerns. If you wish I will forward a copy of this draft to the Chairman of the NAPA team for his information.

Although the NAPA report contains constructive recommendations for implementation or further study, it is clear that we should be proud of the Language School's performance for teaching, testing and staff support.

ILLEG

Donald E. Smith

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence
FROM: Don I. Wortman
Deputy Director for Administration
SUBJECT: NAPA Report on Language Incentive Program

1. The final report of the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) study of the Agency's Language Incentive Program has been reviewed by the four directorates, the Comptroller, the Inspector General, the National Intelligence Council, and the Director of Personnel Policy, Planning and Management.

2. The attached recommendations of the NAPA team have been condensed from statements on each topic in the Executive Summary, statement of goals, and complete text of the report. After a thorough review of the report and the comment, I have recommended actions which are stated in each of the discussion sections. Concurrence of Directorates or staffs in the DDA position can be presumed, unless an attributed objection or distinctive opinion appears.

3. Directorate and staff responses containing detailed comments on selected NAPA team recommendations are attached. NFAC did not submit a written response but has indicated agreement with the NAPA recommendations.

Don I. Wortman

Attachment:

Approved For Release 2004/05/12 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600030001-8
As stated

I. THE NAPA TEAM MADE THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. Eligibility for the Language Incentive Program (LIP)

NAPA Recommendation: Persons hired or appointed to their present positions, based primarily on their language skills, should be excluded from the Language Use Award, Language Achievement Award, and Language Maintenance Award in the language or mutually intelligible languages upon which that appointment was based.

Discussion: Participation in the LIP by language specialists is a basic contradiction of the incentive aspect of the program. The three awards are not appropriate for language specialists who are hired primarily on the basis of their language skills. Alternate courses of action to compensate or reward language specialists will be addressed by a Task Force which is the subject of Recommendation F.

The DDS&T expresses the strong opinion that the present inclusion of [redacted] specialists in the use award portion of the LIP has enabled [redacted] to attract and retain qualified linguists. The Directorate is convinced that no alternative program would achieve the same result as economically or efficiently as the present program. [redacted] denies the assumption that their language specialists are hired primarily for language skills and maintains that language capability is but one facet of the applicant's qualifications which are reviewed. In spite of the DDS&T

25X1

25X1

25X1

objection, I recommend approval of the NAPA recommendation.

APPROVED:

DISAPPROVED:

B. Achievement Awards

NAPA Recommendation: Continue the Achievement Award as an element of the LIP and authorize an increase in the amount of the award, particularly for the more difficult languages.

Discussion: There is consensus on the efficiency of the Achievement Award and the necessity to increase award amounts to maintain its incentive value. Criteria for, and determination of, the amount of the increase will be resolved by the Language Development Committee (LDC). I recommend approval of the NAPA recommendation.

APPROVED:

DISAPPROVED:

C. Language Use Awards (LUAs)

NAPA Recommendation: Continue the Language Use Awards as an element of the LIP but limit participation to full-time positions overseas in which a language is essential.

Discussion: The LUA is a most appropriate award for DDO personnel overseas where the use of language places atypical demands on the individual.

The LDC will consider the adjustment of award payments for difficult languages and those of limited use in the employee's career.

I am concerned over the NAPA team's feeling that all employees in domestic positions should be denied participation in the LUA program, unless these skills are given recognition in some other fashion. The Operations Directorate is also concerned over its [redacted] officers being excluded from participation. Overseas Unit Language Requirement (ULRs) represent 47 percent [redacted] of the total number of ULRs [redacted]. Cost of the program can be cut in half by restricting it to overseas personnel. Therefore, in spite of the expressed concerns, I recommend approval of the NAPA recommendation and that alternative compensation be devised for those recipients who would be eliminated.

APPROVED:

DISAPPROVED:

NAPA Recommendation: Modify the Language Use Award payments for full-time personnel in overseas positions to a tiered scale of \$50, \$40, and \$25 for reduced proficiency in lieu of the current \$50 "all or none" payment for 3-level proficiency in designated skills.

Discussion: This proposal, originally made by the DDO, was approved by the Language Development Committee on 7 August 1980. Your approval will enable the Operations Directorate to begin immediate implementation of revised LUA payments described in detail in Appendix 4 of the NAPA report. Restricting LUA payments to overseas positions

only will reduce potential awards in the Operations directorate by eliminating over 400 Unit Language Requirements. The resulting reduced cost will enable the Directorate's FY-81 budget to accommodate these additional payments. I therefore recommend you approve the NAPA recommendation.

APPROVED:

DISAPPROVED:

D. Language Maintenance Awards

NAPA Recommendation: Continue the Maintenance Award as an element of the LIP and maintain the present correlation of Maintenance Award amount to Achievement Award amount in any increase of the latter amount.

Discussion: The Maintenance Award is one-half the Achievement Award. The Maintenance Award itself and its correlation to the Achievement Award is well-accepted and has demonstrated the potential for improving the reservoir of skills required to meet the Agency's critical language needs.

A refinement of the stated purpose, criteria, and guidelines will be undertaken by the LDC to assure that language maintenance is recognized when it is of immediate or potential benefit to the Agency. I recommend approval of the NAPA recommendation.

APPROVED:

DISAPPROVED:

E. Leadership and Control

NAPA Recommendation: The DDCI will assume language policy leadership, surveillance, and commitment, and delegate staff responsibility to the DDA or the Director, PPPM.

Discussion: In order to institutionalize and insure a long-term consistent approach to language policy and programs, leadership will reside with the DDCI.

Under the DDCI's aegis, the DDA will be responsible for a reconstituted LDC chaired by the DDA (or his designee) and consist of a representative named by each Deputy Director plus representation from OPPPM and OTE. This body will propose to the DDCI, and subsequently implement, language program policies approved by the DDCI, and possess the authority to establish award payment schedules and administrative interpretations and procedures. The LDC, at an early date, will issue a new Headquarters Notice clarifying the intent of the LIP and establishing its goals. The LDC will continue as the principal coordinating body responsible to the DDA on all aspects of the Agency-wide language program, including tracking and evaluating.

Each directorate representative to the LDC will also serve as the specific focal point for directorate-wide monitoring and leadership in the execution of the program. I recommend approval of the NAPA recommendation and that the DDA assume staff responsibility.

APPROVED:

DISAPPROVED:

F. Establishment of Task Force

NAPA Recommendation: Establish a Task Force under the direction of the DDA to review and report upon the classification and compensation of language specialists.

Discussion: Language specialists in the Headquarters area employed in [] OTE, and the DDO will be excluded from LUA participation if LUAs are restricted to overseas positions only. In order to maintain competitive hiring, compensation and retention policies for language specialists, a Task Force will be established to report on-job classification, career opportunities, or special salary rates to be established in lieu of LUAs. LUAs for language specialists will be discontinued upon the implementation of the Task Force recommendation.

The Task Force, to be established by the DDA, will be comprised of representatives of OPPPM, line managers from [] DDO and OTE responsible for language specialists, and representation from NFAC as a major user of these special skills. The Task Force will be established by 1 January 1981, and its report will be completed by 1 January 1982. I recommend approval of the NAPA recommendation.

APPROVED:

DISAPPROVED:

G. Establishment of Language Training Complement

NAPA Recommendation: Establish a language training complement that is not charged against the operating elements to cover full-time assignments to language training of more than 12 weeks' duration.

Discussion: A complement [redacted] which is equivalent

25X1

to six percent of Unit Language Requirement positions and approximately one percent of the present manpower ceiling, is suggested by NAPA. The Operations Directorate indicates concurrence with this recommendation.

While both the Comptroller and I support the desirability of establishing a language training complement to be administered by each Directorate, we recognize the fact that competing priorities for scarce resources may preclude this. I agree with the Comptroller's position, however, that it makes sense to move in this direction and that a request for a language development complement be included in the FY-83 budget. I recommend approval of the NAPA position.

APPROVED:

DISAPPROVED:

H. Mandatory Testing

NAPA Recommendation: Foreign language testing should be made mandatory and the first round of Agency testing of personnel who have a current or particularly useful skill should be completed by 1 January 1983.

Discussion: Inasmuch as foreign language proficiency testing is indispensable to improving language capability in the Agency, foreign language testing should be made mandatory. Realistically, a complete rotation cycle of overseas personnel will be necessary to get an up-to-date tested inventory of existing language skills.

While [redacted] revised 18 July 1978, in 3.b.(2)(d), states that "employees who have developed new foreign language skills will be tested upon reassignment to Headquarters from

25X1

25X1

overseas [redacted]" this regulation has been honored more in the breach than in fact. We do, however, believe that the regulation should be enforced, and we agree with the intent of the recommendation and its goal. Adopting this recommendation would increase Language School testing requirements approximately 50 percent over the next several years. With the current level of resources devoted to testing, it would not be able to absorb this additional workload, and thus we cannot comply with the recommendation nor meet the goal of completing the first round of testing overseas returnees by 1 January 1983. I therefore recommend extending the completion date to 1 January 1984 or allocating additional personnel slots to OTE for the testing program.

APPROVED:

DISAPPROVED:

II. THE NAPA TEAM PROPOSED THE FOLLOWING GOALS:

A. Promotion Considerations

Every employee who is potentially available for overseas assignments or for assignment to domestic positions requiring a foreign language competence should have a tested proficiency at the comprehensive S-3, R-3 level in at least one foreign language before being advanced to the mid-career level. Every officer in the above categories should have two foreign languages as early in mid-career as possible, and before being advanced to the senior levels. This goal should be taken in to account by promotion panels beginning in CY 1982.

Discussion

As a basic foreign language policy for the Agency this goal is commendable but not realistic or indeed appropriate for all Agency officers going overseas. The Operations Directorate feels that it is impractical in the light of burgeoning requirements and present manpower constraints.

Adopting this goal as stated is unworkable; it can however serve as a basis for future planning and emerge in a redefined and more realistic form.

B. Assignments

After 1 January 1982, 60 percent of all new assignments should be filled by persons fully qualified in the required foreign language.

Discussion

The Operations Directorate, whose officers are most affected, cannot countenance this goal until a language development complement has been implemented and in effect for a few years. It is therefore impractical to attempt accomplishment of this goal by the date specified.

C. The three remaining goals concerning mandatory testing, the development complement, and the task force on language specialists were coincident with NAPA recommendations and have been addressed in section I.

III. NAPA TEAM SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS

The remaining suggestions and comments of the NAPA report are summarized below and will be considered by the element which has prime responsibility for evaluating and recommending action. I have serious reservations about the ability of the Language School to implement some of these recommendations without the allocation of additional resources.

A. Language School

In the area of teaching:

--Maximize cost effectiveness when security permits and requirements are limited by sharing language training with that offered by other agencies.

--Determine priorities for instruction and concentrate on developing supplementary instructional material aimed at higher proficiency levels and on meeting specialized requirements.

--Continue conducting part-time Headquarters training and solicit stronger commitment from students for regular attendance--at least 80 percent of scheduled classes.

--Strive to have 60 percent of students complete their scheduled training periods and achieve a proficiency matching the requirements of their new assignment.

--Determine optimum periods of training which will most likely produce the proficiency level required.

--Attempt, with the cooperation of customer directorates, to maintain student attendance for the full-term of training.

In the area of testing:

--Use aptitude tests systematically to screen students before enrollment in hard languages.

--Establish the concept that judgments on communicative facility (the gross ability to express one's ideas whether linguistically correct or not) should not be expected from general proficiency testing.

--Develop specialized reading tests which will measure specialized competence, e.g., economic material.

--Establish procedures to provide prompt feedback and a diagnostic analysis to persons who have been tested.

--Establish a better pre-test briefing on what is significant in arriving at test scores.

--Reassign teachers of lesser ability in testing to other duties.

--In rating native speakers, use a different scale and procedures for judging suitability of native speakers for different language tasks.

--Establish priorities for developing new tests; establish ad hoc arrangements for utilizing tests which are not yet developed; accomplish research and development on language tests and testing procedures with respect to: (a) implications of measured achievement on teaching

methods; (b) length of training required to achieve certain levels of proficiency; (c) correlation between aptitude test scores and achievement; (d) correlation between speaking proficiency and understanding.

--Attempt to establish management support for LS testing standards and reliability.

B. The Language Development Committee

--Accomplish an analysis of each Unit Language Requirement to determine the importance of language to it.

--Establish a policy requiring the assignment of language qualified employees only to language required positions.

--Develop a system to enable an evaluation of the extent to which the Agency is meeting language requirements and the way managers and employees are carrying out their responsibilities in acquiring, utilizing, and maintaining language skills.

--Evaluate the proposed policy of requiring proficiency in a language before a career trainee's trial period is completed.

--Establish special actions or awards for employees who learn/use a limited value language.

--Establish a policy of encouraging use of external language training facilities.

--Establish a meritorious award (including cash payment) or in-step increases for those few employees who achieve a native level of proficiency through study.

--Consider using the Language Maintenance Award as a substitute for the Language Use Award in the United States.

--Start action to develop and maintain data on resources required to meet anticipated increases in testing and training requirements.

C. OPPPM

--Indicate language requirements and the degree of their importance in position descriptions.

--Establish language skills as a factor in Performance Appraisal Reports (PAR).

--Establish language skills as a factor to be considered in promotion consideration, especially beyond the mid-career level.

--Identify clearly language requirements and level of importance for recruiters and prospective employees.

--Establish a policy to employ applicants with poor language aptitude only as an exception.